

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called a Adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:03 p.m., **Wednesday, September 29, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Rene Sakala
Charles Umeda

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Guest Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff suggested that, because of the importance of the Hillside Designation issue, the Planning Commission continue the discussion to a special meeting to allow them to give that portion of the Draft General Plan their full attention. There were no other items to add or delete.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-50 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT -The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the

southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Director Woldruff presented a brief staff report explaining that on September 15, 2004, the Planning Commission discussed the Mixed-Use Designation Areas D and E and expressed concern about the provisions for residential uses in these two areas and directed staff to contact the City of Redlands for the General Plan and Zoning information for land uses along and in the vicinity of our common boundaries. Ms. Woldruff added that due to time constraints, the Planning Commission did not discuss the Hillside Designation at this meeting.

Director Woldruff stated that as requested by the Planning Commission, staff contacted the City of Redlands to obtain the most current General Plan and Zoning Maps and that a comparison of the maps from 2001 to the current versions shows that nothing has changed in terms of land use designations or zoning for this area in the last three to four years. The following provides a general summary of the land uses that are planned by the City of Redlands in the vicinity of Mixed-Use Areas G and J.

- From Redlands Boulevard south to Park Avenue – High Density Residential Uses with Commercial/ Industrial Uses located further east;
- From Park Avenue south almost to Orange Avenue – Commercial/Industrial Uses;
- From just north of Orange Avenue to a point midway between Orange Avenue and Barton Road – Medium Density Residential; and,
- From a point midway between Orange Avenue and Barton Road to just below Barton Road – Very Low Density Residential Uses

Ms. Woldruff explained that recent economic feasibility studies and fiscal analyses prepared for the Draft General Plan (June 2004) and development projects in the Mission District indicate that there is limited absorption for business-park, light industrial, office, commercial retail, and service uses and that the Mixed-Use Areas proposed for the Mission District in the Draft General Plan were developed based on these factors. She added that the studies did indicate that a mix of residential with limited commercial retail and service uses would meet current market needs. She concluded by saying that one of the advantages of the Mixed-Use concept was that it allowed the flexibility necessary to keep up with market changes.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the discussion regarding concerns expressed by Commissioner Umeda at the meeting of September 15, 2004 in terms of the balance between housing and other types of uses in Mixed-Use Areas G and J. Staff provided the Commissioners with copies of the Market Analysis and Fiscal reports that were required for the Spanos project located at the corner of California Street and Orange Avenue to help them in their discussion. Concerns were reiterated regarding density, transportation and traffic issues; however the discussion centered on the commercial development and setting aside Mixed-Use Areas G and J for future commercial uses.

Chair Rosenbaum pointed out that, in consideration of the Mixed-use Designation for areas G and J, the Planning Commission, had three choices:

- Leave the Industrial Park Designation as is for the next 30 to 50 years to see if commercial uses come to the area;
- Allow the changes to Mixed-use as proposed in the Draft General Plan Update; or
- Reduce and modify the proposed designation.

Chair Rosenbaum asked Mr. Zola to clarify for the Commission the three options she mentioned:

- Leave the Draft General Plan as proposed;
- Increase the emphasis on Office, Industrial and Light industrial uses, or Designate the area for Business Park;

As an example, Mr. Zola proposed language such as “Residential development would not be allowed along California Street and Redlands Boulevard”, and he explained that if the market for those uses was not present within the Office, Industrial and Light industrial designation, the City would have to actively recruit potential commercial and industrial users to the area.

Mr. Zola explained that the third option to reduce or modify the designation would require that the California Street frontage be retained as commercial or Business Park uses and that no residential uses be allowed along that street. He added that by choosing that designation, the City would also be taking on the responsibility of recruiting businesses for that area.

Commissioner Umeda asked why the City of Redlands was able to recruit commercial and light industrial that the City of Loma Linda was not. Director Woldruff explained that Redlands could provide incentives, financial or otherwise, for businesses to move to their City that the Loma Linda could offer.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:58 p.m.

Mr. Paul Hsu, 20151 Seal Point Lane, Huntington Beach, CA addressed the Commission to explain that he represented property owners in Mixed-Use Areas G and J. Mr. Hsu stated that he understood that in area J, there were 90 acres in the City’s Sphere of Influence, and in Area G, 78 acres in. He stated that of the 78 acres in Area J, the intent was for 44 acres to be used for commercial uses on California Street north of Citrus Avenue and only 26 acres for residential. He added that the Spanish Church held a smaller parcel of eight acres. He commented that the land was currently orange groves, which was not a viable use of the land. Mr. Hsu concluded his comments by requesting that the Planning Commission keep the Mixed-use designation for areas G and J according to the Draft General Plan Update.

Tom Nieves, AEI-CASC, 937 S. via Lata, Ste 500, Colton CA, commented that he was working with Mr. Hsu and requested that the Mixed-use designation be maintained as detailed in the Draft General Plan Update to allow for land use creativity. He added, in reference to Commissioner Christianson’s comment about a gateway to the City of Loma Linda, that there were many ways to accomplish a distinctive gateway such as entries, treatments, setbacks, and landscape, and reiterated his support for the designation as proposed.

Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst Street, Fountain Valley CA, stated that he represented a small piece of property in Planning Area G and requested that the proposed Mixed-Use designation in the Draft General Plan Update. He added that their project was a residential use, with a density under the requirement of 13 units per acre. He added that they were planning a for-sale product with CCRs for entry level or retired homebuyers.

Roger Peter Porter, 3837 E. 7th Street, Long Beach CA, stated that he was co-developer of the 2.74 acres on the south west corner of Orange and New Jersey and supported the Mixed-use designation in the Draft General Plan Update. He added that their target identity was working class people, that their project was below the required density and was a quality project. He explained that had he known that the property could become zoned commercial he would not have purchased it. Mr. Porter commented on the issues of traffic stating that developers paid development fees to address that problem. On the issue of identity of the City, he mentioned that there were firms that specialized in providing signage to that effect. Mr. Porter reiterated that he supported the Mixed-Use designation for Mixed-Use Areas G and J.

Director Woldruff pointed out that letters had been received from Mr. Hsu. Mr. Porter followed up with a letter to the City of Loma Linda by the Concord Group, which prepared one of the Economic Feasibility Studies provided to the Planning Commission and a companion letter prepared for Mr. Porter providing preliminary assessment of commercial development opportunity for Mr. Porter's property.

John Shumway, Concord Group, 130 Newport Center Drive, Suite 230, Newport Beach CA stated that he supported of the Mixed-Use zoning being proposed. He explained that they were strategic land use consultants who determined, through market analysis, the best use of a property for many cities throughout California. He complimented staff for proposing a flexible plan in updating the General Plan. Mr. Shumway indicated that their study concluded that a business use would not be appropriate for the area because the cost of the land was too high and therefore commercial types of uses would not be economically viable. Mr. Shumway reiterated his support of Mixed-use because it was the most appropriate and flexible for the future growth of Loma Linda.

Chair Rosenbaum commented, and Mr. Shumway concurred, that it was likely that if a commercial designation was established for the area, commercial developers would need to be subsidized in order to be able to offer the properties a practical amount of rental for the commercial units.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda CA commented that he was disturbed by the few options being suggested as being the only viable ones because in his opinion that was a large spectrum of alternatives. He also commented on the issue of "taking" and imminent domain. He indicated that the studies provided by the previous speakers were in favor of the best economical use of their clients' land and was for the short term not the long term as the General Plan was trying to plan for. Mr. Zirkle concluded his comments with references to concerns regarding traffic, increase in population, and the detrimental effects of high density on the City of Loma Linda. He asked the Planning Commission to do what was best for the community.

Hugo Chinchay, 26382 Antonio Circle, Loma Linda CA stated that he was a long time resident of Loma Linda and was speaking for the community. He presented the Planning Commissions with letters on behalf of 350 members of the Loma Linda SDA Spanish Church, 900 members of the Loma Linda Filipino Church located at the site under discussion, the Vice President of the Salvation California Conference and a letter from himself representing the Salvation California Conference Executive Committee. He added that he was in support of the Mixed-Use designation and requested that Area J not become a commercial zoning in consideration for worshippers on Sabbath Day. Mr. Chinchay commented that he knew many young professionals

who could not afford homes in Loma Linda, but would like to be closer to their church and their jobs.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, CA referred to a newspaper article concerning the residents of the City of Redlands who were feeling crowded by 15 homes being constructed on 10 acres. She continued to say the feeling driving through Redlands was very different from Loma Linda and signage was not necessary to see the difference. She requested that the Planning Commission develop a vision of what Loma Linda should look like.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, Loma Linda, CA spoke to the increase in population because of the proposed high density designation, air quality, and traffic if the Mixed-Use Designation was approved for the General Plan Update.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda CA, commented that:

- Highest and best use was not always economics;
- Vision of Loma Linda needed for the long term;
- Commercial development needed not more residential;
- Supported Option 3 – Modification of the proposed Mixed-use designation.

Roger Peter Porter, 3837 E. 7th Street, Long Beach CA on the issues of trees, Mr. Porter stated that their project was planning on planting 110 trees on 2.7 acres and would also save the existing large palm trees on New Jersey Street. Director Woldruff indicated that Mr. Porter's comments were project-specific and could not be addressed at this time.

Vice Chair Neff commented on the following topics:

- Reports provided by staff do not support commercial use in those planning areas and spoke to providing development for housing for people who work in the city or who would like to move to the city;
- Professional people working in Loma Linda could not find homes in the city;
- Traffic issues – Development fees were collected to correct the problem;
- Measure I in force and proposed to be extended to continue to provide repair for local road, paving, widening, installation of signals, correcting busy intersection, and improving on/off freeway ramps;
- Review of the Traffic Impact Analysis and the Circulation Element;
- Church members want to live in the Loma Linda area;
- Commercial uses along main arteries would remain vacant while the residential in the center of the area would have developed;

Vice Chair Neff stated that he supported the Mixed-Use Designation for Areas G & J and was ready to make a motion.

Commissioner Umeda commented that the letters provided by the churches seemed to imply that the current zoning was being changed from residential uses to commercial, although the area already had a commercial designation.

A discussion ensued regarding the views of the community in regards to high density, future of commercial uses, and the ability of commercial development to conform to the Historic Mission Overlay District.

Director Woldruff commented that staff had noted the Planning Commission's comments and concerns and stated that she felt that staff could formulate language to bring back to the Commission at a later date.

Mr. Zola summarized the discussion and stated that he could bring back some specific wording. He indicated that three different objectives:

- Employment Generation which starts pushing towards business park, industrial and office uses;
- Sales tax generation commercial leading towards the retail uses;
- Affordable housing, which was pushing the high density.

He added that the direction that the Planning Commission did not want to take:

- Create a broad area of high density uses, and that the majority of the Commissioners don't want high density; and,
- Create a fairly high intensity traffic generator as a whole.

Mr. Zola indicated that he understood that the Planning Commission wanted to:

- Formulate language to modify the policies to come up with a pattern that would fit the existing approvals;
- Maintain the frontages on California Street for commercial, Business Park, and office uses, and provide for a mix of uses that would have high density but also some low density uses for a better mix of residential density through this area;
- The one thing that's been very clear is that we should not create a situation, even if it's commercial on the frontage and a broad of high density after that.

Mr. Zola stated that he and staff would come back with wording that provided a balance between those objectives and the things that the Planning Commission and the residents did not want in regards to high density.

Director Woldruff stated that the language would provide opportunities, some type of performance standards, and proof of what is doable to bring forward with projects on an individual basis.

Commissioner Umeda wished to direct Mr. Zola to at least attempt to come up with something of a compromise so that the Planning Commission could be supportive of the language to forward to the City Council. Director Woldruff concurred that staff would like to send forward a consensus on those Mixed-Use Areas.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and carried 4-1, Rosenbaum opposed, to continue this item to October 20, 2004 to allow the consultant time to draft language for Mixed-Use areas G & J for further review by PC, and to discuss the Hillside Area Mixed-Use.

REPORT BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

A discussion developed regarding student housing and the lack of opportunity for people to purchase a home and become residents of the City of Loma Linda. Director Woldruff suggested that the issue could be agendized as a study session in the near future.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff reported that:

- City Council had approved the Mission Creek project on Mission Road;
- City Manager stated that he would like to see the General Plan Update on the agenda for October 12, 2004
- Jeri DeSmet, the Department's part-time Office Assistant would be retiring in December 2004;
- Code Enforcement had been moved to the Community Development Department as of July 1, 2004 and that the cubicles facing the Department counter would be reconfigured shortly. Director Woldruff explained that Code Enforcement Officers were typically under the supervision Community Development Departments in other cities.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting to the Regular Meeting of October 6, 2004.

Minutes approved at the adjourned regular meeting of June 28, 2006.

Administrative Secretary